

**The Sun**  
AND NEW YORK PRESS.  
FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1919.  
MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.  
Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.  
Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.  
One Six One  
Year, Months, Months.  
DAILY SUNDAY \$10.00 \$2.00 \$1.00  
DAILY only \$5.00 \$1.00 \$1.00  
SUNDAY only \$1.00 \$1.00 \$1.00  
DAILY & SUNDAY \$10.00 \$2.00 \$1.00  
DAILY only \$5.00 \$1.00 \$1.00  
SUNDAY only \$1.00 \$1.00 \$1.00  
DAILY & SUNDAY \$10.00 \$2.00 \$1.00  
DAILY only \$5.00 \$1.00 \$1.00  
SUNDAY only \$1.00 \$1.00 \$1.00  
THE EVENING SUN \$10.00 \$2.00 \$1.00  
Foreign, 10.00 2.00 1.00  
BOOKS AND THE BOOK WORLD  
(weekly), one year, \$1.00  
Canada, \$1.50  
All checks, money orders, etc., to be made payable to THE SUN.  
Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association, 150 Nassau St., Borough at Manhattan, N. Y. President, Frank A. Munsey. Vice President, Edwin W. Wardman. Secretary, R. H. Threlkeld. Treasurer, Wm. T. Dewar. All of 100 Nassau Street.  
If our friends who favor us with manuscripts and illustrations for publication wish to have their names retained they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.  
TELEPHONE, BECKMAN 2200.

the Spanish-American war cannot arise. To understand the folly of such a suggestion an intelligent person has only to examine the map of the world to-day. In both hemispheres there are communities and races whose wrongs no liberal mind can ignore and whose sufferings, already loudly proclaimed, may lead to revolt at any moment; and the League of Nations design would bind the hands of every generous nation on earth which might feel it a moral right and duty to succor the oppressed.

**The Precedent of the Federal Constitution.**

With increasing frequency we find such utterances as the subjoined from our neighbor the *World* among the outcries which come from the supporters of President Wilson's scheme for a League of Nations:

"Practically every argument presented by Senator Knox in his fervid support of the Constitution of the United States against the proposed League of Nations was a repetition of the arguments of the Americans who in 1787-88 opposed the adoption of that Constitution."

The Constitution presented to the American commonwealths by the convention of 1787 was indeed vigorously opposed. It required the delegation of certain powers by each of thirteen free and independent sovereignties to the federated State it was designed to create.

But one thing is overlooked by those who cite this opposition to the adoption of the Constitution. That is the fact that it resulted in the proposal by the First Congress in its first session of ten amendments to the Constitution prepared by the convention. These amendments were promptly ratified by the States and were declared to be in force December 15, 1791. These amendments were introduced with a preamble which read as follows:

"The conventions of a number of the States having, at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added, and as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution: Resolved . . ."

Thus the citizens of the thirteen American sovereignties exercised their rights as free men to protest against what they conceived to be possible dangers to their liberties in the proposed Constitution, and compelled the adoption of amendments adequate, in their judgment, to protect their hard won rights.

What our forefathers did then is exactly parallel to what the patriotic opponents of President Wilson's scheme of super-sovereignty are doing now. Those early Americans demanded, protection of their privileges and rights. They refused, as their descendants now refuse, to accept a constitution they believed to be inimical to their dearest interests. They compelled its amendment to satisfy their fears and to assure their enjoyment of the freedom they had struggled ardently with minds and bodies to win.

They achieved success in their endeavors, and their successors, who inherited and are the trustees of the liberty they won and made secure, will in the same manner be victorious in the struggle now in progress for the preservation of Americanism, unless Americanism has fallen so low that it has ceased to be a predominant factor in the internal and external affairs of the United States.

**Spenderthrifts.**  
Perhaps it is too early to expect to see a spenderthrift of the first water rise from the oil fields of Texas, whence come tales of fortunes made overnight. Perhaps none will ever come, for is not July 1, or January 16 at the latest, to put an end to that interior combustion fuel which runs the brain motor of extravagance?

Out of the Alaska Golconda came a few men made wild by new money; but none of them was so original in his openhandedness as to be remembered. A little later the East was invaded by Death Valley Scott, but his squandering was so carefully and conscientiously done that it became evident that he was engaged in the promotion of the mines where he was supposed to have gained sudden riches. Now and then a worthy citizen of Wilkesbarre comes to New York to be a millionaire for a day. But even he has failed to thrill. Strangely no spenderthrift has ever warned the American imagination so much as the man whose exploits are still vaguely remembered after sixty years: the reckless hero of the first American oil fever.

We say "vaguely remembered" because when Oil John is talked of it is usually said that he spent a million or two. Really it was much less. He came by the money more honestly than he came by the name that is still the synonym for foolish dissipation, for he possibly never took a gallon of oil out of the ground. His proper name was JOHN STEELE and he was the adopted son of a humble widow named McCLINTOCK, who had a little farm on Oil Creek in Venango county, Pennsylvania. John was a married man working as the driver of an oil wagon at the then magnificent wage of \$5 a day when the oil fever was at its height and his foster mother died, leaving him the heir-at-law. He sold his inheritance for \$300,000 cash and at the end of nine months his wife had divorced him and he was back looking for a job. A hundred thousand of the money was devoted to the

debatable pleasure of lending to friends; the rest went to the joys of the hour.  
It is a tribute to JOHN STEELE, and perhaps it accounts for the fact that his name has not perished, that he had to meet spending difficulties that are now absent. There were no motor cars in the '60s, and possibly John did not know there was racing at Saratoga. He could get drunk on champagne for \$15 and have all the ham and eggs he wanted for a dollar or so. He overcame the handicaps of the low cost of living by hiring "hacks," filling them with boon companions and "baskets of wine" and, after riding about, kicking out the windows and cutting the upholstery to bits. Then what was there to do but pay the liverman a thousand or two and present the horses to the admiring driver? The biggest day of his career was when he hired the Girard House in Philadelphia for \$3,000 and threw it open to everybody.

Coal Oil John was not only peripatetic but more consistent than ordinary spenderthrifts. A week after his last dollar was supposedly gone he discovered that \$25,000 of his fortune still slept, overlooked, in one of the banks. He put aside the baggage truck which he was trundling in his native village of Rouleville, got the \$25,000 and sent it flying after the other moneys that he had put into circulation. Not until it was gone would he return to the commonplaces of life. Eventually, reunited with his wife, he became a farmer, but he died long before \$2.25 worth might have made him rich and silly again.

Such a person would not go well nowadays. The "hack" is out of fashion, if not almost extinct. The squandering of \$300,000 would have to be done in some unusual manner to put a dent in public curiosity. Men make a million speculating in stocks and lose it again before their friends have time to borrow \$100,000. They do not go to smashing baggage when ruin arrives, but start fake oil companies instead. Coal Oil John probably never thought of that.

**Hope for the Down-trodden and Over-taxed Commuter.**  
Governor SMITH's reply to the protest of Governor RUNYON of New Jersey on the subject of commuters and State income taxes is soothing enough. At least it holds out hope to the men who live in New Jersey and work in New York that the New York Legislature will remedy "one possible injustice and one error," as Governor SMITH phrases it, early enough in this next session to relieve the Jersey-men. The "possible injustice" is the failure of the new law to put commuters on the same footing with residents in the matter of exemptions. The error in the law is that deductive clause which would deduct from the commuter's income, under \$10,000, a tax of 2 per cent—twice as much as the New York resident is asked to pay.

As the New York Legislature will not meet until about two months before the first tax has to be paid, careful commuters will put aside enough money to pay the tax on the basis of the law as it stands. Then, if an amendment is made according to Governor SMITH's sense of justice, the commuter will have just so much to spend for new tires next spring.

**The Plea of the Turk.**  
The Turkish Peace Mission, which arrived at Paris last week, has been received by the Council of Ten of the Peace Conference. This mission, as has been previously stated, is not an official delegation of the Ottoman Empire but a body of experts familiar with conditions in Turkey, and its appearance before the council was for the purpose of making for the use of the conference a statement of the salient points of the situation in European and Asiatic Turkey and their bearing upon the present Near East question. The Grand Vizier, DAMAD FAKH PASHA, the head of the mission, however, took advantage of the audience to make a plea for the preservation of the Turkish Empire.

The Grand Vizier was in a position to speak with sincerity and frankness in this matter; for he represents the opponents of the Committee of Union and Progress, the ruling Turkish clique during the war, and also the new Government that has come into power since the flight of ENVER PASHA and his associates and the enthronement of the new Sultan. He said that the Turkish people had nothing to do with Turkey's alliance with the Central Powers, that Turkey was dragged into the war through a secret agreement entered into by the Committee of Union and Progress, and that a German Admiral on a German warship was the person responsible for the hostile acts that made Turkey a cobelligerent with Germany and Austria-Hungary.

This is an abject confession for a Turkish Grand Vizier to make. It is undoubtedly in a great measure true. The representatives of the allied Powers at Constantinople at the beginning of the war exonerated the Sultan, MOHAMMED V., from any responsibility for the declaration of hostilities, principally, perhaps, on account of his feeble mental and physical condition. They reported, too, that the attack of the Turkish warships upon Russian Black Sea ports, the exploit which marked Turkey's entrance into the war, was ordered by ENVER PASHA without the approval of the Ottoman Parliament and without consultation with members of his Cabinet. The disclosures made since the flight of ENVER PASHA show that the flight of ENVER PASHA was not more than German agents who had taken

advantage of Turkey's weakness to seize the Government.  
It may be true that the members of the present Government are entirely free from any responsibility for the massacres in Asia Minor. They are at least free from official responsibility, and that they are making an effort to punish some of the perpetrators of these barbarities is undoubtedly true. But accepting the statement of the Grand Vizier at their full value, they cannot be said to present a valid reason for relieving Turkey of her war responsibility and for turning the Ottoman Empire intact over to the rule of the Turk.

The clique which the Grand Vizier now condemns was made up of the men who at the time of the revolution of 1906 and the overthrow of HAMID represented to the world the hope of a government which would bring freedom to the people and which would reform the evils of years of Turkish misrule. Instead they became as great autocrats as the Amuraths or Mustafas, and were more notorious in their oppression of the non-Turkish races than the Red Sultan, whom they had dethroned. The Turk failed here as miserably as a ruler as he had in every other chance civilization had given him since he crossed the Bosphorus and came into Europe.

So far the Allies have given no indication of the present status of Turkey; they have, in fact, not recognized the existence of the Ottoman Empire or acknowledged that it is to be a party to peace negotiations. The question which to-day obviously demands an answer from the conference is not what the war Government of Turkey did, but is any government of Turkey by the Turks possible which will respect the rights and the lives of all its subjects?

It is regrettable that the bill introduced by Representative LA GUARDIA to provide a new Federal building for this city must, under the House rules, be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. That committee seldom reports a bill for a single building. Like the pensions committee, it usually takes all the bills referred to it and scrambles them into one omnibus bill, for obvious reasons. The fate of the resulting mess has been referred to the Committee on Congress to stomach, and the good falls with the bad. If Rabbit Corners, N. Y., cannot have a \$100,000 post office New York cannot have a Federal court house capable of being ventilated, drained and lighted.

London takes the overseas flight coolly, we are told. But not so coolly as did the men who took the flight. Does not a resolution asking for an investigation of existing conditions in Mexico seem more at home in the American Congress than would one concerning the state of affairs in Mesopotamia or in the Desert of Gobi?

Prince of Denmark comes to visit America—Headline of yesterday.  
To see and what not to see; that is the question!

A popular actress asserted before a meeting of motion picture managers that "one reform the movies need badly is the elimination of those sixteen-year-old blondes and brunettes who play the part of the business expert knowledge of the business thoughtful person must there give pause and then ask if a motion picture producer, even the most reckless spender, can make a successful start out of any blonde or brunette miss without the aid and consent of the public. The public can and will corrupt any motion picture company by the easy process of not going to see its stars if it does not want to go and see them."

Well, old Sol's reappearance as Secretary of Time has been officially confirmed by the Senate and the House.  
Another price increase in the autumn has been announced by shoe dealers and manufacturers. Footwear seems rather tardy in getting on its price footing.

So the Fourth of July this year is to be safe, sane, and sober.  
From the *Star* and *Stripes*, May 2.  
It has appeared among us—that fourth service stripe. There are thousands of ones and twos and threes, but that fourth one sticks out like a beacon in a fog. There are just four men, as far as is known, now in France who have gained the right to stick that extra gold V on their left sleeve.

Captain C. W. Eaton, Paris representative of the Army Educational Commission, is one. The Colonel was military attaché in Switzerland when the United States declared a state of war. Being overseas his six month period began to run coincidentally with our participation in the conflict. Others who were overseas at the same time were General Frank Parker, now with the First Division, at that time an observer over here; and Colonel Sanford Wadhams, U. S. M. C., A. E. F., another American soldier who was in France in April, 1917.

Incidentally four stripes will begin to appear on others very soon, for May, 1917, saw several American hospital units landing in France. Most of these Yanks have sailed for home, but a goodly number is left.

**Hardships of the Georgia Candidate.**  
From the *Times* and *Georgia*, May 2.  
With the stumps gone and wire fences replacing the worn rails, what the candidates sit on when election time comes around?

**Getting on the Georgia Tax List.**  
Correspondence Atlanta Constitution.  
Thursday of last week was tax assessing day here. We went over and assessed our poll tax and our dog.

**The Record.**  
They lie upon the shining sand. From team of silver swine. With all the rainbow's glowing tints. Within their polished whorls. Rose pink and gold and amethyst. And glints of lustrous green. And pale translucent pearl that holds The moonlight's milky sheen.

I press a pink lipped beauty close Against my listening ear. Against the music of the deep. Therein imprisoned hear. For lo! the shells of ocean with Their tuneful monotone. Are records of sea changes from Old Neptune's graphophone.

**MINNA IRLING.**

**THE PEOPLE AND THE LEAGUE.**  
George Washington Instructs Woodrow Wilson.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Your editorial article of June 17, "President and Senate as Treaty Makers Again," brings up very rightly the consideration that too much importance cannot be accorded to construction given by general acquiescence to the treaty provisions of the Constitution while many of its framers were alive and active in public affairs, that is, as to the right and duty of the Senate in treaty making from its inception.

In this connection the example of Washington in the instance of the appointment of John Jay as special envoy for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with Great Britain is in point. The nomination of John Jay having been made to the Senate on April 14, 1794, and duly confirmed, the treaty was negotiated and sent by the President to the Senate for its ratification on June 8, 1794, accompanied by a message beginning as follows:

In pursuance of my nomination of John Jay as envoy extraordinary to his Britannic Majesty on the 14th day of April, 1794, and of the advice and consent of the Senate thereto on the 19th, a negotiation was opened.

Thus in the view of Washington the advice and consent of the Senate were requisite to the opening of the negotiation, and that opinion—that the Senate should be consulted in treaty making—was maintained by him throughout his life.

Later when the House of Representatives sought to invoke a right to inquire into the negotiation of that treaty our first President, in his message to the House of March 30, 1796, said:

Having been a member of the General Convention, and knowing the principles on which the Constitution was founded, I have ever entertained but one opinion on this subject, and from the first establishment of the Government to this moment my conduct has been governed by that opinion. The power of making treaties is exclusively vested in the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Washington thus gave a clear insight into his understanding of the joint and equal character of the functions of President and Senate in treaty making from its inception. In order to depart from that example and that guidance his latest successor found it necessary to abandon the seat of Government even when Congress was in session, a course which, if justified in his case, should have been followed also by the Senate.

**Things Overlooked by Secretary Daniels in a Recent Address.**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Secretary Daniels in his address to the graduates of the University of Maryland last week asked, "Why cannot all of us lay aside partisanship, prejudice, and sectional feeling, and together as patriotic Americans for the solution of these questions for the best interests of our country and humanity?"

He ought to have thought of that before he spoke to our wandering President before he went abroad over six months ago—the same official who declared peace in session, a course which, if justified in his case, should have been followed also by the Senate.

Read the address all through and you would think that we had thrown away all the results of the war because somebody in the Senate had the hardihood to criticize the League of Peace. How long is it since the President became infatuated? Who has he had any command from the people to voice their wishes? Did he get it last November? Not much!

**How About That Cadaver?**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: In view of what President Wilson undertook to accomplish by removing his post of duty from Washington to Paris, may he not now be styled "the undertaker of the League of Nations?"

**Confessions About the Foreign View.**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Shall I speak the plain truth of sentiment in Europe? Over there they simply believe that America is a land of 100,000,000 hicks. They look on Wilson as the Super-Hick among us, and I can assure you as an absolute fact that while they listen with solemn eagerness to Wilson's talk of manly civilization and the future welfare of the universe, behind his back they are letting themselves go in prolonged and inexpressible laughter.

This fact I think has begun to dawn on Mr. Wilson, and that is why his famous smile now looks pale and wintry in his latest photographs.

**The Mexican Mandate.**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: What a wonder you are! Sober, serious, sympathetic, gay, but always with understanding. Sure, give England the mandate for Mexico, and for God's sake let's don't do anything that appears selfish. Not even we lose the last American citizen who, tired of being taxed and skinned and badgered to death, seeks to recuperate his riddled fortunes by attempting to stick up some business outposts outside our borders.

By 1903 the League of Nations ought to have a lot of good advice fixed up as a panacea for what he appeared in 1919.

**The Smuts League.**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: By the way, this proposed League of Nations cult was the offspring of the brain of General Smuts of South Africa. The American draft for a league of nations was drawn from the discarded, so after all, the proposed League of Nations cannot be accredited to the former president of Princeton University. He is only carrying it around with him so the gettys up of other new cults cannot get all the glory that is now being handed down by the uplift crowd.

There confronts the world now a great controversy, to wit, which is the greater, the Ten Commandments or the Fourteen?

**But Who Has Placed the Power There?**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: For six months steadily the American people have been fed upon insidious assumptions against the validity of free collective government. Steadily stupor was wrought against this, the hallowed, sacred, and protected by the forcible seizure of the cables, not only

from Europe but to Europe. To the latest moment when Woodrow Wilson last trod these shores he hurried defiance at his countrymen, declaring that he alone should state to Europe our attitude toward the League of Nations, and declaring that he would see that the Peace Treaty document was so entangled with the covenant draft that the Senate would be forced to sign it in haste, on the dotted line.

Do we realize the terrible mistake we have made in placing such power in the hands of one man? Can anything wake up the United States to get behind the Republican Senators quickly, intelligently, sternly? ANNA RUTHERFORD, BROOKLYN, June 19.

**Remarks on an Oversight of the Late Benedict Arnold.**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Benedict Arnold was, after all, only a poor piker. Had he the foresight to form a League of Nations under the false pretence of establishing universal peace he might have won up with his great work. Thus Arnold could have recanted the Declaration of Independence and delivered his country bond hand and foot over to its former enemy forever, and thereby he would have gone down in fatal points further than West Point.

Arnold, however, was a man without vision, without the historic perspective, and he was not sufficient master of seductive phrases to deceive the people into believing in him when he meant another. He was unskilled in rhetoric, which some Frenchman has called the art of concealing thought. Arnold lived out of his time and therefore missed his glorious opportunity of being acclaimed a patriot by a deluded people who he had robbed of their birthright of liberty. JOHN H. JORDAN, SCRANTON, Pa., June 19.

**Who Proposes the Repeal of the Declaration of Independence?**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: One hundred and forty-three years ago the founder of the Democratic party penned the Declaration of Independence. During all the years since elapsed the day of its adoption has been kept and observed as Independence Day. Every Presidential proclamation, every writ and every act of the Executive branch of the Government since that time has proclaimed the year of the Independence of the United States. Until the present time our Independence has been our proudest possession.

Of what did our fathers declare the United States of America to be free and independent? The mighty declaration is:

That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all future connection between them and the State of Great Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States they have full power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do.

It is now proposed to render this venerable American "free paper" to surrender our cherished independence, and to accept dependence upon Great Britain. Instead of having full power to "levy war, etc., and to do all other acts and things which Independent States may of right do," we are asked to yield to the British Empire all the rights of Nations in which we have but one vote and the British Empire five, and whose bidding we must do.

It would seem enough to be asked to abandon the policies of Washington and Monroe, and to violate our hitherto sacred Constitution, and to be asked to destroy the Declaration of Independence, which is the very foundation stone of our national structure.

**Is the Senate on Trial?**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: It can be learned from the caption of a recent *Times* editorial article that the United States Senate is now "on trial." This report is based on the fact that it is remembered, whose political complexion the American people thought it wise to change last November, and did change, under circumstances which seemed to give it a clear mandate to check and avert certain dangers threatening the country through the course of the Administration. If these majority representatives of the whole people are on trial, then the nation itself is on trial, for it put them there.

**A Volunteered Portrait.**  
From a personal letter.  
I want a daily paper that is squarely and continuously against Wilsonism; against his time talk and tinkering; against the characterisation of his cheap idealism; against the balance sheet of his would-be imperial proclamations in which there is the glitter of sand without its substance, and where the oasis of truth and the well spring of genuine, original thinking are conspicuous by their absence. I am sick at heart with his super-arrogance, his autocratization and attempted rulership of the world. I want a paper that will greatly contribute to the awakening of the country from what seems a case of hypnotism—hypnotized by the man who would waste peace without victory, and now that American dead lie in Flanders fields and desecrated France still wants it and seems in his rôle of Marplot of the nations about to be a President.

**The Most Momentous Question in the History of the Nation.**  
From the *American Law Review*.  
The question whether the League in its present form shall be approved by the Senate is the most important problem that has arisen in the history of the nation. It involves momentous consequences and responsibility. It is a national question and ought not to be mixed up with party politics, but be considered most thoughtfully and thoroughly. These last questions require a new interpretation of the Constitution, for while treaties are recognized by it certain powers are entrusted to the Executive and Congress which cannot be delegated. Undoubtedly the league means a surrender of some governmental powers and leaves to the decision of a foreign tribunal the determination of some national policies.

**American History Not Forgotten.**  
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Please keep the good work you are doing. I refer to your fight against the league and treaty as they are now written. There are people in our country who would have us forget we ever had a Valley Forge, a Bunker Hill, a 1776. But they are still "ours." M. F. GILCHRIST, NEWARK, Conn., June 19.

**WILSON'S EXCUSE IS RIDDLED IN HOUSE**  
Temple Shows Washington Six Times Set Treaty Precedent President Denies.

**JEFFERSON ADVISED IT**  
Four Other Presidents Submitted Unfinished Treaties to Upper House.

**Special Despatch to THE SUN.**  
WASHINGTON, June 19.—The inadequacy of President Wilson's excuse in declining to submit the peace treaty to the Senate in unfinished form, that he could find "no precedent illustrated in the House by Representative Temple (Pa.), member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to-day.

The Pennsylvania member, one of the recognized authorities in the House on international affairs, quoted from an authority widely known to students of history to show that President Washington on six different occasions consulted the Senate by formal message on unfinished treaties, and that Presidents Polk, Lincoln, Johnson and Grant each, on at least one occasion submitted unfinished drafts of treaties under negotiation to the Senate for advice and suggestion before completing the negotiations.

**Quoted Jefferson's Advice.**  
He further quoted from the papers of President Washington's Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, to prove that the patron saint of the Democratic party advised the first President that it was advisable, whenever possible, to consult the Senate before the opening of negotiations, since its subsequent approbation was necessary to validate the treaty. "The counsel," he said, "was of great importance," and that the President had followed it from that time to the present.

This is shown by comparison of Article III. of the original draft of the new draft, Article III. of the new draft, which contains the following provisions: "The council shall consist of representatives of the United States of America, of the British Empire, of France, of Italy and of Japan, together with representatives of four other members of the league."

Article IV. of the corresponding provision in the new covenant, contains this language: "The council shall consist of representatives of the principal allied and associated Powers, together with representatives of four other members of the league."

"I have not found," said Dr. Temple, "anywhere in the treaty a definition of the phrase 'the principal allied and associated Powers,' though that phrase is used in Article 44, which provides that the whole treaty (including of course the League of Nations section) shall come into force when ratified by Germany and the council of principal allied and associated Powers."

"Originally there were to be nine members of the council; now the number has been reduced to five. Formerly five great Powers were named in the treaty and four smaller ones. There may perhaps be more than five Powers claiming the right to be members of the council. If the phrase is not defined who knows how many nations may claim to be of the 'principal allied and associated Powers'?"

**Thinks Wilson Misquoted.**  
Commenting on the letter of the Acting Secretary of State transmitting to the Senate a message from the President in which the latter claimed to make available the text of the treaty now under consideration, Dr. Temple said:

"It is true that only in exceptional instances has the President of the United States communicated officially to the Senate the text of a treaty which he only provided for the Senate to make available the text of the treaty now under consideration, Dr. Temple said:

"It is true that only in exceptional instances has the President of the United States communicated officially to the Senate the text of a treaty which he only provided for the Senate to make available the text of the treaty now under consideration, Dr. Temple said:

Quoting from "Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement," by Samuel B. Cranford, one of the best known works on the subject, Dr. Temple listed the following instances in refutation of the President's excuse:

June 10, 1846, President Polk submitted to the Senate for its advice the incomplete draft of a treaty with Great Britain on the Oregon boundary. It was formally approved by the Senate, completed by the President, approved in the final form by the Senate and ratified all within nine days.

December 17, 1861, President Lincoln submitted to the Senate for its advice a preliminary draft of a treaty with Mexico.

February 19, 1868, President Johnson sent to the Senate for its advice an unsigned and unfinished treaty with the Thonon Convention.

June 18, 1874, President Grant submitted to the Senate for advice a proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty with Great Britain, which the Senate, after long deliberation, advised against.

**Senate Queried in Algeria Pact.**  
After enumerating several instances in which President Washington consulted the Senate by formal message on the subject of proposed treaties with Indian tribes, Dr. Temple continued:

"In a message to the Senate of February 9, 1793, President Washington mentioned the difference between the United States and Great Britain as to the Northwestern boundary, and said that he considered it advisable to postpone any negotiations on the subject until he had received the advice of the Senate as to the proposition to be offered on the subject of the United States."

**THE WEATHER**  
MINIATURE ALMANAC.  
Sun rises... Standard Time... S. P. M.  
Moon rises... 12:00 A. M.

**For eastern New York**—Partly cloudy to-day, probably local showers tonight and to-morrow; gentle to moderate southerly winds.  
For New Jersey—Fair to-day, warmer in interior; to-morrow partly cloudy, probably showers; gentle to moderate southerly winds.  
For northern New England—Fair to-day, warmer in interior; to-morrow partly cloudy, probably showers in Vermont and New Hampshire; moderate southerly winds.  
For southern New England—Fair to-day, warmer on mainland; to-morrow probably showers; moderate southerly winds, milder in the interior.  
For western New York—Local showers tonight and to-morrow; moderate southerly winds, milder in the interior.

Observations at United States Weather Bureau stations taken at 8 P. M. yesterday, except fifty-five meridian times:

Albany	58	30.00	SE	Clear
Albany	58	30.00	SE	Clear
Baltimore	60	30.12	SE	Clear
Baltimore	60	30.12	SE	Clear
Buffalo	52	30.08	SE	Clear
Buffalo	52	30.08	SE	Clear
Charleston	54	30.08	SE	Clear
Charleston	54	30.08	SE	Clear
Cincinnati	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Cincinnati	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Cleveland	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Cleveland	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Detroit	52	30.08	SE	Clear
Detroit	52	30.08	SE	Clear
Galveston	52	30.08	SE	Clear
Galveston	52	30.08	SE	Clear
Indianapolis	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Indianapolis	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Jacksonville	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Jacksonville	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Kansas City	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Kansas City	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Los Angeles	62	30.08	SE	Clear
Los Angeles	62	30.08	SE	Clear
Memphis	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Memphis	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Minneapolis	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Minneapolis	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Mobile	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Mobile	58	30.08	SE	Clear
New Orleans	58	30.08	SE	Clear
New Orleans	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Philadelphia	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Philadelphia	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Pittsburgh	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Pittsburgh	58	30.08	SE	Clear
Portland, Me.	58	30		